

## **REMARKS**

### ***In the Specification***

Applicant amended the Abstract to address language and format informalities.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5-7 were objected to because of the informalities listed on pages 2-4 of the Office Action mailed November 15, 2007.

Applicant amended claims 1, 2, and 5-7 to address these informalities. Applicant cancelled claim 4. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)***

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Japanese Pat. No. 8061329 to Showa Aluminum ("Showa").

Applicant respectfully submits that Showa does not anticipate currently amended claims 1 or 6 because Showa does not disclose every element of currently amended claims 1 or 6. For example, Showa does not disclose an edge region of the first hollow profile including a quadrilateral cutout, curved corresponding to an edge radius, which extends along the separating cut over the entire edge radius, and is disposed symmetrically to the separating cut.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections to currently amended claims 1 and 6. Applicant also respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections to dependent claims 2, 7, and 10 because they depend upon allowable base claim 1 or 6.

### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)***

#### ***Claims 3-5***

Claims 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable

---

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner also states that Showa does not disclose this element. See the Office Action mailed November 15, 2007 at p. 7.

over Showa in view of U.S. Pat. No. 809,061 to Hoover ("Hoover").

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Showa and Hoover do not make Applicant's amended claim 1 obvious because it does not teach or suggest every claimed element. In particular, the combination of Showa and Hoover does not teach or suggest an edge region of the first hollow profile including a quadrilateral cutout, curved corresponding to an edge radius, which extends along the separating cut over the entire edge radius, and is disposed symmetrically to the separating cut.<sup>2</sup>

As discussed in *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)*, Showa does not teach or suggest every element of amended claim 1.

The Examiner alleged that Hoover's elements B and H teach or suggest Applicant's claimed first hollow profile and quadrilateral cutout. See the Office Action mailed November 15, 2007 at p. 7. However, B and H do not teach or suggest a first hollow profile and quadrilateral cutout because B and H are structurally distinct from any hollow profile or quadrilateral cutout.

Hoover's element H is a bent down lip. See Hoover at FIGS. 3, 5, and 7. Element H is not hollow and does not have a hollow profile. Furthermore, Element H is not a quadrilateral cutout because it does not have four cutout sides like Applicant's claimed structure. Rather, element H is a solid tab, extending from an open, crescent iron, having a fastener hole. Element H is also distinguishable from Applicant's claimed structure because element H does not extend along the separating cut over the entire edge radius and is not disposed symmetrically to the separating cut. Rather, element H extends along a fraction of the iron and is asymmetric to the separating cut.

Hoover's element B is an iron with an upper concave surface. See Hoover at p. 1, ll. 85-87 and FIGS. 3, 5, and 7. Element B is not a first hollow profile because it is not hollow and does not have a hollow profile like Applicant's claimed structure. Rather, element B is open and has a crescent profile. Furthermore, Element H is not a quadrilateral cutout because it does not have four cutout sides like Applicant's claimed structure. Rather, element B has a single, curved side. Element B is also distinguishable from Applicant's claimed structure because element B does not have any feature

---

<sup>2</sup> Applicant also respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 4 is now moot because claim 4 is cancelled.

extending along the separating cut over the entire edge radius, and does not have any feature disposed symmetrically to the separating cut.

The Examiner also alleged that it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to modify the joint structure of Showa using the cutouts of Hoover to produce Applicant's claimed invention. See the Office Action mailed November 15, 2007 at p. 7-8. However, no combination or simple substitution of Showa and Hoover will yield amended claim 1 as a predictable result because Showa and Hoover do not include every element of amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections to claims 3 and 5, because they depend upon allowable base claim 1.

#### ***Claims 8 and 9***

Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Showa in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,332,281 to Janotik et al. ("Janotik").

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Showa and Janotik do not make Applicant's amended claim 6 obvious because it does not teach or suggest every claimed element. In particular, the combination of Showa and Janotik does not teach or suggest an edge region of the first hollow profile including a quadrilateral cutout, curved corresponding to an edge radius, which extends along the separating cut over the entire edge radius, and is disposed symmetrically to the separating cut.

As discussed in *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)*, Showa does not teach or suggest every element of currently amended claim 6.

The Examiner cited Janotik in connection with hydroforming and element 118. See the Office Action mailed November 15, 2007 at p. 7. However, Janotik does not teach or suggest an edge region of the first hollow profile including a quadrilateral cutout, curved corresponding to an edge radius, which extends along the separating cut over the entire edge radius, and is disposed symmetrically to the separating cut.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections to claims 8 and 9, because they depend upon amended and

allowable base claim 6.

***Claim 11***

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Showa in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,190,207 to Peck et al. (“Peck”).

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Showa and Peck do not make Applicant’s amended claim 6 obvious because it does not teach or suggest every claimed element. In particular, the combination of Showa and Peck does not teach or suggest an edge region of the first hollow profile including a quadrilateral cutout, curved corresponding to an edge radius, which extends along the separating cut over the entire edge radius, and is disposed symmetrically to the separating cut.

As discussed in *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)*, Showa does not teach or suggest every element of currently amended claim 6.

The Examiner cited Peck in connection with laser welding. See the Office Action mailed November 15, 2007 at p. 9. However, Peck does not teach or suggest an edge region of the first hollow profile including a quadrilateral cutout, curved corresponding to an edge radius, which extends along the separating cut over the entire edge radius, and is disposed symmetrically to the separating cut.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections to claim 11, because it depends upon amended and allowable base claim 6.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and requests early favorable action. If the Examiner believes a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is welcome to contact Applicant's Agent at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 13, 2008

/s/Isaac A. Hubner, Reg. No. 61,393/

Isaac A. Hubner, Reg. No. 61,393

Agent for the Applicant

Proskauer Rose LLP

One International Place

Boston, MA 02110

Tel. No.: (617) 526-9893

Fax No.: (617) 526-9899

Attachment: A clean, non-marked up copy of the amended Abstract